

# Meigs County Telegraph.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL--DEVOTED TO POLITICS, LITERATURE, AGRICULTURE, COMMERCE, AND NEWS.

\$1.50 in advance

Editor and Proprietor.

POMEROY, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1856.

NEW SERIES, VOL. 1, NO. 5.

"Independent in all things--Neutral in nothing."

## THE TELEGRAPH.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY  
A. THOMSON.  
Office in Third Story of Branch's Brick Building, near  
the Court-House.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:  
\$1.50 in advance; \$2.00, if paid  
within the year; or \$2.50  
if not paid until the  
year has expired.

No paper will be discontinued until all arrearages are paid, except at the option of the publisher.

TO CLERKS OF THE PRESS, or more, the paper will be furnished at a liberal discount in price.

The Law of Newspapers.

1. Subscribers who do not give express notice to the contrary, are considered as wishing to continue their subscription.

2. If a subscriber neglects or refuses to take their paper, the publisher is not responsible for its non-delivery, and the paper is considered as having been sent to the subscriber's residence.

3. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

4. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

5. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

6. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

7. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

8. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

9. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

10. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

11. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

12. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

13. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

14. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

15. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

16. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

17. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

18. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

19. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

20. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

21. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

22. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

23. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

24. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

25. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

26. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

27. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

28. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

29. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

30. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

31. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

32. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

33. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

34. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

35. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

36. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

37. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

38. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

39. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

40. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

41. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

42. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

43. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

44. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

45. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

46. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

47. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

48. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

49. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

50. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

51. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

52. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

53. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

54. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

55. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

56. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

57. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

58. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

59. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

60. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

61. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

62. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

63. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

64. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

65. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

66. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

67. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

68. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

69. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

70. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

71. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

72. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

73. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

74. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

75. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

76. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

77. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

78. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

79. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

80. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

81. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

82. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

83. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

84. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

85. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

86. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

87. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

88. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

89. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

90. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.

91. The courts have decided that refusing to take a newspaper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, is prima facie evidence of intentional fraud.

92. If any subscriber removes to another place without informing the publisher, and their paper is sent to the former address, the subscriber is held responsible.



"PERSEVERE."

POMEROY, OHIO.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1856.

## ANOTHER HALF SHEET.

We are again compelled to issue on a half sheet. Our reasons are many--the principal ones, are: We have not paper enough for a full sheet, our office is in the same uncomfortable and unfinished state, election excitement runs high, and job work is pressing. We hope and expect that we shall be able to issue on a full sheet hereafter. At all events, we are determined to get out some kind of a paper every week, until after the Presidential election.

## THE MASS MEETINGS.

Within the past two or three weeks, all three political parties have had their Grand Mass Meetings in Pomeroiy, and as yet we have said nothing about any, by way of description. In fact, we did not attend any; but as our office is centrally located, we had a fair view of what was going on. First came the "Democratic Mass Meeting," which had been duly announced by handbills and runners for several days previously, to take place on Saturday, Sept. 27th, at 10 o'clock, A. M., at which time, the public were informed that Hon. David Tod, Hon. A. C. Thurman, Hon. G. W. McCook, Hon. Wm. Medill, and others, would be present and address the multitude. Democrats, and citizens all, were invited to come up and have a Grand Council.

Well, Saturday, Sept. 27th, 10 o'clock, A. M., arrived, and so did some of the orators, namely, Messrs. Medill, McCook, and Fink. But the people did not come. During the forenoon, several sterling Republicans, from the country, called at our office to ascertain whether there would be any Democratic meeting in town that day. They said they had seen the handbills, and had come out of curiosity, to see the great men, and hear what they had to say; but, seeing nothing unusual going on, they were about to return. We advised them to "wait until evening." Thus the forenoon passed away.

Between 1 and 2 o'clock in the afternoon, bearing a terrible noise, and supposing a dog fight, or row of some kind was taking place, we ran to the window, and the sight we beheld beggars description. About a hundred or so of the shabbiest looking men and boys we have beheld in a long time were following after a big flag, in the utmost confusion, and yelling like so many fiends. This, we were informed, was the Grand Democratic Procession. "O, our bleeding country," thought we, "has it come to this!" But we said nothing. Had we belonged to a party thus represented, we should certainly have hung our head in shame, whenever we thought of that "procession." After this "demonstration," we understand, quite a number of our citizens, from curiosity, repaired to the place where the speaking was to "come off," until the audience numbered about four hundred in all--more than one-half Republican. The speaking lasted until after 5 o'clock, and passed off quietly.

In the evening, we understand, Gov. Medill held forth at some place in the upper end of town; and the others in Middleport. With the exception of the yelling of a few drunken rowdies and ragged urchins, we noticed nothing unusual. The town did not seem to contain many more visitors than is usual on Saturdays, and the speaking seemed to create very little sensation. Had the Republicans staid at home in the afternoon, there would have been scarcely a corporal's guard in attendance. Thus ended the great Democratic Mass Meeting.

On the Saturday following, namely, October 4th, at noon, we started to dinner, as usual, not once imagining that anything unusual was expected to take place on that day. As we were passing the tavern, an acquaintance from Gallia county hailed us, and inquired where the Fillmore Mass Meeting was to be held. We informed him that it was to be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

and we expected to

be held at that moment given us.

He then ever received more meeting

er eminent speakers would be here at that

time. After cautioning him against plac-

ing too much reliance upon any thing com-

ing from the Cincinnati Times, we left

him. We afterward learned that some

half dozen other individuals were seen in

town that day, on a similar errand, and that

some of our waggish boys amused them-

selves by sending them to several promi-

nent Fremonters, telling them they were

the only Fillmore men in town. Beyond

this, we believe nothing unusual occurred.

Thus passed off the Fillmore demon-

stration.

The Republican mass meeting was ad-

vertised for Tuesday, October 7th. Eminent

speakers from abroad had been an-

nounced; but it was ascertained previous

to the day of meeting that these speakers

would not be present. And here we wish

to remark that the Republican State Cen-

tral Committee have treated this county

very unfairly. Harsher language might

justly be used; but we forbear. This is

the second time they have disappointed us

during this campaign. But, notwithstand-

ing this disappointment, the day was usher-

ed in by a national salute. Early in the

forenoon, the crowds came in, from all

quarters. Rutland came in, with martial

music, and colors flying. The steamer Con-

cor brought in its hundreds, who were es-

corted to the place of speaking by the Mid-

dleport Brass Band. In fact, the town

was literally alive with people before noon.

One remarkable feature was the crowds of

ladies in attendance, marching in the pro-